1				
2	IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF THE STATE OF OREGON			
3	FOR LINN COUNTY			
4	4 GREEN CROSS DISPENSARY, LLC; CASE NO.: 19C			
5	GAYLE ASHFORD, AND RANDY SIMPSON	SECOND AMENDED COMPLAINT		
6	Plaintiffs	42 U.S.C. 1983 –		
7		FIRST AMENDMENT;		
8	v.	VIOLATION OF THE FOURTEENTH AMENDMENT'S GUARANTEES OF		
9	CITY OF BROWNSVILLE, A MUNICIPAL	EQUAL PROTECTION-		
9	CORPORATION OF OREGON; City of	CLASS OF ONE		
10	Brownsville Planning Commissioners Bryan Wyant, Mike McDaniel, Gary			
11	Bryan Wyant, Mike McDaniel, Gary Compton, Josh Kometz and Rob; Scott	PRAYER: \$120,000		
12	McDowell, City Administrator; City	(ORS 21.160(1)(c); \$560) NOT SUBJECT TO ARBITRATION		
12	Councilors Block, Shepherd, Chambers and	DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL		
13	Neddeau,			
14	Defendants			
15				
16	INTRODUCTION			
17				
18	1. This is a civil action for damages and attorney's fees, for unlawfully denying			
19	plaintiffs a conditional use permit required to obtain an OLCC License to operate a			
20	recreational cannabis dispensary. Despite the undisputed fact that Oregon state law required			
21	the City of Brownsville to grant the permit, both the Planning Commission, then the City			
22	Council, denied the application, openly stating that were individually against marijuana for a			
23	variety of reasons. This represent a violation o	f the equal protections of law (Fourteenth		
24	Amendment), under 42 U.S.C. 1983, as class of one.			
25				
26	2. These individuals' outward dislike	for marijuana along with the disdain and		

1 - AMENDED COMPLAINT

disparaging remarks about its presence in the community, despite the state legalizing the 2 recreational sale of marijuana, operated to deny these plaintiffs their First Amendment right 3 to discuss the commercial activity involved in the selling of recreational cannabis. 4 **PARTIES** 5 3. At all relevant times, plaintiffs were and are residents of the state of Oregon; 6 Green Cross Dispensary, LLC as a registered Oregon Corporation, and Mr. Randy Simpson 7 8 and Ms. Gayle Ashford are Oregon residents, and controlling members of Green Cross 9 Dispensary, LLC. 10 Defendant City of Brownsville (hereafter 'City') is a municipal corporation 4. 11 charged with and responsible for all license approvals and legislation within the City, 12 including land use and City Planning. At all relevant times Defendant City had the power, 13 14 right and duty to control the manner in which the individual defendants in this lawsuit carried 15 out the objectives of their employment, and to see that all orders, rules, training, instructions 16 and regulations promulgated for the City were consistent with the State and Federal 17 Constitutions, Statutes, and the laws of the municipality. 18 The City Council and Planning Commission were at all times a function of the 19 City. The individual defendants named in this lawsuit-- City of Brownsville Planning 20 21 Commissioners Wyant, McDaniel, Compton, Josh Kometz and Rob; Scott McDowell, City Administrator; 22 City Councilors Block, Shepherd, Chambers and Neddeau -- were at all material times 23 acting under color of state law and acting as an agent/employee of the Coty and within the 24 course and scope of their employment. They are sued in their individual capacity. 25 6. The individual Defendants' acts which are the subject of this lawsuit were 26

2 3

1

4 5 6

8 9

7

11

10

13

12

14 15

16

17 18

19

20

21

22

23 24

25

26

AMENDED COMPLAINT

undertaken in the regular course of their employment for Defendant City.

FACTUAL OVERVIEW

- 7. In accordance with Oregon law, if the City of Brownsville wants to do prohibit recreational cannabis dispensaries within City limits, it must put the question to the voters at the next election. They put the question to the voters, and the prohibition was voted down. At that point, according to Oregon law, the City of Brownsville must allow recreational cannabis dispensaries within City limits.
- 8. These claims arise out of the unlawful denial of a conditional use permit required by OLCC for Plaintiffs to apply for their license allowing them to open their recreational sales of cannabis dispensary, titled Green Cross Dispensary. The denial came first from the Planning Commission, then, following a timely appeal, the denial was upheld by the city council. A LUBA Appeal was timely filed, resulting in the City Council reversing its decision.
- 9. Plaintiff's application for conditional use permit application was deemed complete May 30th, 2017. Within 60 days after the Plaintiff's application for a conditional use was received, in accordance with BMC 15.125.030.C, July 17, 2017 the planning commission held a hearing. On July 31, 2017, the planning commission denied the application, and on August 1, 2017 it was registered. A copy of the July 31, 2017 transcript is attached hereto. This denial could start the two-year statute of limitations to run. The stronger argument is that time would begin after the city council upheld the denial (see, Paragraph 11, Infra). Because the City would not agree to that date, Plaintiffs file this action at this time to preserve all aspects of the timeliness of the claim.

10. A timely appeal was filed to the Brownsville City Council. The city council heard the appeal, upholding the planning Commission's denial, September 26, 2017. These are the minutes of that meeting, relevant to Plaintiffs' appeal:

McDowell stated that this is an issue that has certainly divided this community. This issue puts these Councilors, Staff, neighbors, and users at odds. He does not envy any of the people to his left that have to make these kinds of decisions. He applauds all who are here tonight. To articulate for the public record, this has never just been about marijuana. Some folks think that the U.S. Constitution is being ignored and the Federal law is being broken. There is a strong body that believes that nationally. In the State of Oregon, voters did approve Measure 91, legalizing marijuana, and some will argue that it is unconstitutional. It is split down the line in this room tonight. City Staff and City Councilors are charged with discharging certain responsibilities. The City Attorney is focused on not getting the City involved in a liability situation. Liability is precarious at best. If the Simpsons appeal to LUBA(Land Use Board of Appeals) some folks are saying that the City's argument will not stand and the City will probably lose. With that said, sometimes Councils have to make decisions that they don't want to make. Councilor Gerber stated that she will be voting in the same way as she did before. She believes the Simpsons have met the conditions and that they City did vote in favor of recreational and medical marijuana. However, she would definitely vote for a City ordinance limiting outdoor marijuana grows outdoors; the City should be able to legally control that. Mayor Don Ware said that he will be voting the same as well. An official vote was called for. Voting to deny the approval were Councilor Shepherd, Block, Chambers, and Neddeau. Voting against the denial were Mayor Don Ware and Councilor Gerber. The denial motion passed, 4-2.

4 - AMENDED COMPLAINT

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

(Emphasis in original)

11. Following the City's reversal of the decision to uphold the Planning Commission's denial, a LUCS (Land Use Compatibility Statement), needed to complete the OLCC Application, was issued to Plaintiffs, and the application was submitted shortly thereafter.

12. Plaintiffs dis not fully obtain their OLCC license until July 2018—more than oneyear after they submitted their application for conditional use permit in May 2017.

13. The record of sales from May 2017 to June 2018 are:

May-17	17
Jun-17	144
Jul-17	218
Aug-17	184
Sep-17	243
Oct-17	189
Nov-17	170
Dec-17	128
	1,293
Jan-18	204
Feb-18	112
Mar-18	141
Apr-18	192
May-18	141
Jun-18	100
	890
	2,183

14. In accordance with those experienced and expert in the field, long-time marijuana dispensary owner—both medical and then recreational -- the average recreational

5 - AMENDED COMPLAINT

now that the recreational dispensary is operational. 15. Separately, there were these out-of-pocket expenses attributable to the unlawful denial: 15. Separately, there were these out-of-pocket expenses attributable to the unlawful denial: 16. Legal fees: \$1,000 17. Legal fees: \$1,000 18. Licensing fees: \$4,000 (they had to obtain another, unnecessary, medical license) 19. (Violation of Constitutional Right to Free Speech and Assembly) 10. (42 U.S.C. § 1983, First Amendment to the U.S. Constitution) 11. (Individual Defendants) 12. By their actions as described herein, the individual defendants, under color of statute, ordinance, regulation, custom, or usage, unlawfully denied Plaintiffs their right to the license necessary to practice their trade, and engage in the type of speech and assembly necessarily included in the practices of that trade, solely because they dislike and disfavor the content of the trade, its speech and its assembly, through unbridled discretion, subjected Plaintiffs to deprivation of their liberty interests, which constitutes rights, privileges, or immunities secured by the Constitution and laws. 18. As a direct and proximate result of the deprivation of Plaintiffs' rights, Plaintiffs sustained actual damages, including loss of liberty; mental and emotional suffering; humiliation; shame; embarrassment; worry; fear; anguish; shock; nervousness; and anxiety;
now that the recreational dispensary is operational. 15. Separately, there were these out-of-pocket expenses attributable to the unlawful denial: Legal fees: \$7,000 Transcript fees: \$1,000 Licensing fees: \$4,000 (they had to obtain another, unnecessary, medical license) FIRST CLAIM FOR RELIEF (Violation of Constitutional Right to Free Speech and Assembly) (42 U.S.C. § 1983, First Amendment to the U.S. Constitution) (Individual Defendants) 16. The foregoing paragraphs are incorporated herein by reference. 17. By their actions as described herein, the individual defendants, under color of statute, ordinance, regulation, custom, or usage, unlawfully denied Plaintiffs their right to the license necessary to practice their trade, and engage in the type of speech and assembly necessarily included in the practices of that trade, solely because they dislike and disfavor the content of the trade, its speech and its assembly, through unbridled discretion, subjected Plaintiffs to deprivation of their liberty interests, which constitutes rights, privileges, or immunities secured by the Constitution and laws. 18. As a direct and proximate result of the deprivation of Plaintiffs' rights, Plaintiffs sustained actual damages, including loss of liberty; mental and emotional suffering;
denial: Legal fees: \$7,000 Transcript fees: \$1,000 Licensing fees: \$4,000 (they had to obtain another, unnecessary, medical license) FIRST CLAIM FOR RELIEF (Violation of Constitutional Right to Free Speech and Assembly) (42 U.S.C. § 1983, First Amendment to the U.S. Constitution) (Individual Defendants) 16. The foregoing paragraphs are incorporated herein by reference. 17. By their actions as described herein, the individual defendants, under color of statute, ordinance, regulation, custom, or usage, unlawfully denied Plaintiffs their right to the license necessary to practice their trade, and engage in the type of speech and assembly necessarily included in the practices of that trade, solely because they dislike and disfavor the content of the trade, its speech and its assembly, through unbridled discretion, subjected Plaintiffs to deprivation of their liberty interests, which constitutes rights, privileges, or immunities secured by the Constitution and laws. 18. As a direct and proximate result of the deprivation of Plaintiffs' rights, Plaintiffs sustained actual damages, including loss of liberty; mental and emotional suffering;
Legal fees: \$7,000 Transcript fees: \$1,000 Licensing fees: \$4,000 (they had to obtain another, unnecessary, medical license) FIRST CLAIM FOR RELIEF (Violation of Constitutional Right to Free Speech and Assembly) (42 U.S.C. § 1983, First Amendment to the U.S. Constitution) (Individual Defendants) 16. The foregoing paragraphs are incorporated herein by reference. 17. By their actions as described herein, the individual defendants, under color of statute, ordinance, regulation, custom, or usage, unlawfully denied Plaintiffs their right to the license necessary to practice their trade, and engage in the type of speech and assembly necessarily included in the practices of that trade, solely because they dislike and disfavor the content of the trade, its speech and its assembly, through unbridled discretion, subjected Plaintiffs to deprivation of their liberty interests, which constitutes rights, privileges, or immunities secured by the Constitution and laws. 18. As a direct and proximate result of the deprivation of Plaintiffs' rights, Plaintiffs sustained actual damages, including loss of liberty; mental and emotional suffering;
Transcript fees: \$1,000 Licensing fees: \$4,000 (they had to obtain another, unnecessary, medical license) FIRST CLAIM FOR RELIEF (Violation of Constitutional Right to Free Speech and Assembly) (42 U.S.C. § 1983, First Amendment to the U.S. Constitution) (Individual Defendants) 16. The foregoing paragraphs are incorporated herein by reference. 17. By their actions as described herein, the individual defendants, under color of statute, ordinance, regulation, custom, or usage, unlawfully denied Plaintiffs their right to the license necessary to practice their trade, and engage in the type of speech and assembly necessarily included in the practices of that trade, solely because they dislike and disfavor the content of the trade, its speech and its assembly, through unbridled discretion, subjected Plaintiffs to deprivation of their liberty interests, which constitutes rights, privileges, or immunities secured by the Constitution and laws. 18. As a direct and proximate result of the deprivation of Plaintiffs' rights, Plaintiffs sustained actual damages, including loss of liberty; mental and emotional suffering;
Licensing fees: \$4,000 (they had to obtain another, unnecessary, medical license) FIRST CLAIM FOR RELIEF (Violation of Constitutional Right to Free Speech and Assembly) (42 U.S.C. § 1983, First Amendment to the U.S. Constitution) (Individual Defendants) 16. The foregoing paragraphs are incorporated herein by reference. 17. By their actions as described herein, the individual defendants, under color of statute, ordinance, regulation, custom, or usage, unlawfully denied Plaintiffs their right to the license necessary to practice their trade, and engage in the type of speech and assembly necessarily included in the practices of that trade, solely because they dislike and disfavor the content of the trade, its speech and its assembly, through unbridled discretion, subjected Plaintiffs to deprivation of their liberty interests, which constitutes rights, privileges, or immunities secured by the Constitution and laws. 18. As a direct and proximate result of the deprivation of Plaintiffs' rights, Plaintiffs sustained actual damages, including loss of liberty; mental and emotional suffering;
FIRST CLAIM FOR RELIEF (Violation of Constitutional Right to Free Speech and Assembly) (42 U.S.C. § 1983, First Amendment to the U.S. Constitution) (Individual Defendants) 16. The foregoing paragraphs are incorporated herein by reference. 17. By their actions as described herein, the individual defendants, under color of statute, ordinance, regulation, custom, or usage, unlawfully denied Plaintiffs their right to the license necessary to practice their trade, and engage in the type of speech and assembly necessarily included in the practices of that trade, solely because they dislike and disfavor the content of the trade, its speech and its assembly, through unbridled discretion, subjected Plaintiffs to deprivation of their liberty interests, which constitutes rights, privileges, or immunities secured by the Constitution and laws. 18. As a direct and proximate result of the deprivation of Plaintiffs' rights, Plaintiffs sustained actual damages, including loss of liberty; mental and emotional suffering;
FIRST CLAIM FOR RELIEF (Violation of Constitutional Right to Free Speech and Assembly) (42 U.S.C. § 1983, First Amendment to the U.S. Constitution) (Individual Defendants) 16. The foregoing paragraphs are incorporated herein by reference. 17. By their actions as described herein, the individual defendants, under color of statute, ordinance, regulation, custom, or usage, unlawfully denied Plaintiffs their right to the license necessary to practice their trade, and engage in the type of speech and assembly necessarily included in the practices of that trade, solely because they dislike and disfavor the content of the trade, its speech and its assembly, through unbridled discretion, subjected Plaintiffs to deprivation of their liberty interests, which constitutes rights, privileges, or immunities secured by the Constitution and laws. 18. As a direct and proximate result of the deprivation of Plaintiffs' rights, Plaintiffs sustained actual damages, including loss of liberty; mental and emotional suffering;
15. He foregoing paragraphs are incorporated nerein by reference. 17. By their actions as described herein, the individual defendants, under color of statute, ordinance, regulation, custom, or usage, unlawfully denied Plaintiffs their right to the license necessary to practice their trade, and engage in the type of speech and assembly necessarily included in the practices of that trade, solely because they dislike and disfavor the content of the trade, its speech and its assembly, through unbridled discretion, subjected Plaintiffs to deprivation of their liberty interests, which constitutes rights, privileges, or immunities secured by the Constitution and laws. 18. As a direct and proximate result of the deprivation of Plaintiffs' rights, Plaintiffs sustained actual damages, including loss of liberty; mental and emotional suffering;
17. By their actions as described herein, the individual defendants, under color of statute, ordinance, regulation, custom, or usage, unlawfully denied Plaintiffs their right to the license necessary to practice their trade, and engage in the type of speech and assembly necessarily included in the practices of that trade, solely because they dislike and disfavor the content of the trade, its speech and its assembly, through unbridled discretion, subjected Plaintiffs to deprivation of their liberty interests, which constitutes rights, privileges, or immunities secured by the Constitution and laws. 18. As a direct and proximate result of the deprivation of Plaintiffs' rights, Plaintiffs sustained actual damages, including loss of liberty; mental and emotional suffering;
statute, ordinance, regulation, custom, or usage, unlawfully denied Plaintiffs their right to the license necessary to practice their trade, and engage in the type of speech and assembly necessarily included in the practices of that trade, solely because they dislike and disfavor the content of the trade, its speech and its assembly, through unbridled discretion, subjected Plaintiffs to deprivation of their liberty interests, which constitutes rights, privileges, or immunities secured by the Constitution and laws. 18. As a direct and proximate result of the deprivation of Plaintiffs' rights, Plaintiffs sustained actual damages, including loss of liberty; mental and emotional suffering;
license necessary to practice their trade, and engage in the type of speech and assembly necessarily included in the practices of that trade, solely because they dislike and disfavor the content of the trade, its speech and its assembly, through unbridled discretion, subjected Plaintiffs to deprivation of their liberty interests, which constitutes rights, privileges, or immunities secured by the Constitution and laws. 18. As a direct and proximate result of the deprivation of Plaintiffs' rights, Plaintiffs sustained actual damages, including loss of liberty; mental and emotional suffering;
content of the trade, its speech and its assembly, through unbridled discretion, subjected Plaintiffs to deprivation of their liberty interests, which constitutes rights, privileges, or immunities secured by the Constitution and laws. 18. As a direct and proximate result of the deprivation of Plaintiffs' rights, Plaintiffs sustained actual damages, including loss of liberty; mental and emotional suffering;
Plaintiffs to deprivation of their liberty interests, which constitutes rights, privileges, or immunities secured by the Constitution and laws. 18. As a direct and proximate result of the deprivation of Plaintiffs' rights, Plaintiffs sustained actual damages, including loss of liberty; mental and emotional suffering;
immunities secured by the Constitution and laws. 18. As a direct and proximate result of the deprivation of Plaintiffs' rights, Plaintiffs sustained actual damages, including loss of liberty; mental and emotional suffering;
immunities secured by the Constitution and laws. 18. As a direct and proximate result of the deprivation of Plaintiffs' rights, Plaintiffs sustained actual damages, including loss of liberty; mental and emotional suffering;
18. As a direct and proximate result of the deprivation of Plaintiffs' rights, Plaintiffs sustained actual damages, including loss of liberty; mental and emotional suffering;
Plaintiffs sustained actual damages, including loss of liberty; mental and emotional suffering;
humiliation; shame; embarrassment; worry; fear; anguish; shock; nervousness; and anxiety;
•

all to her damage in an amount to be ascertained according to proof at trial.

- 19. As a direct and proximate result of the unlawful actions of Defendants in this claim, Plaintiffs sustained actual damages as detailed in Paragraphs 14 and 15 of this Complaint.
- 20. The actions of the individual Defendants, as described in this First Claim For Relief, herein, were malicious, deliberate, intentional, and embarked upon with the knowledge of, or in conscious disregard of, the harm that would be inflicted upon Plaintiffs. As a result of said intentional conduct, Plaintiffs will be seeking punitive damages against the individual Defendants in an amount sufficient to punish them and to deter others from like conduct.
- 21. Plaintiffs were required to hire attorneys to represent them in this matter and is entitled to an award of reasonable attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1988.
 - 22. Plaintiffs are entitled to a jury trial.

SECOND CLAIM FOR RELIEF VIOLATION OF THE FOURTEENTH AMENDMENT'S GUARANTEES OF EQUAL PROTECTION (42 U.S.C. § 1983)

(42 U.S.C. § 1983, Fourteenth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution Class of One) (Individual Defendants)

- 23. The foregoing paragraphs are incorporated herein by reference.
- 24. By their actions as described herein, the individual defendants, under color of statute, ordinance, regulation, custom, or usage, subjected plaintiffs to the deprivation of rights, privileges, or immunities secured by the Fourteenth Amendment of United States

7 - AMENDED COMPLAINT

Constitution and laws, by unlawfully denying Plaintiffs their right to the license necessary to practice their trade, solely due to their animus toward the content of plaintiffs' class status—a lawful recreational cannabis dispensary. Thereby singling out these Plaintiffs as a class of one. The Equal Protection Clause ensures that all persons similarly situated should be treated alike. Similarly situated in this instance means all persons applying for a conditional use permit. The equal protection guarantee protects not only groups, but individuals who would constitute a "class of one." Where, as here, state action does not implicate a fundamental right or a suspect classification, the plaintiff can establish a "class of one" equal protection claim by demonstrating that it has been intentionally treated differently from others similarly situated and that there is no rational basis for the difference in treatment. Plaintiffs in this instance, unlike most if not all others, were in the unique position of having a mandate from Oregon statutes to have their conditional use permit be granted by Defendants.

- 25. As a direct result of this unequal treatment under the laws by defendants, Plaintiffs were subjected to deprivation of their liberty interests, which constitutes rights, privileges, or immunities secured by the Constitution and laws.
- 26. As a direct and proximate result of the deprivation of Plaintiffs' rights, Plaintiffs sustained actual damages, including loss of liberty; mental and emotional suffering; humiliation; shame; embarrassment; worry; fear; anguish; shock; nervousness; and anxiety; all to her damage in an amount to be ascertained according to proof at trial.
- 27. As a direct and proximate result of the unlawful actions of Defendants in this claim, Plaintiffs sustained actual damages as detailed in Paragraphs 14 and 15 of this Complaint.

8 - AMENDED COMPLAINT

	Τ	
	2	
	3	
	4	
	5	
	6	
	7	
	8	
	9	
1	0	
1	1	
1	2	
1	3	
1	4	
1	5	
1	6	
1	7	
1	8	
1	9	
2	0	
2	1	
2	2	
2	3	
2	4	
2	5	
2	6	

1 II

- 28. The actions of the individual Defendants, as described in this First Claim For Relief, herein, were malicious, deliberate, intentional, and embarked upon with the knowledge of, or in conscious disregard of, the harm that would be inflicted upon Plaintiffs. As a result of said intentional conduct, Plaintiffs will be seeking punitive damages against the individual Defendants in an amount sufficient to punish them and to deter others from like conduct.
- 29. Plaintiffs were required to hire attorneys to represent her in this matter and is entitled to an award of reasonable attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1988.
 - 30. Plaintiffs are entitled to a jury trial.

FOURTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF

(Municipal Liability Claim - 42 U.S.C. § 1983;

<u>Monell v. Dept. of Social Services</u> and <u>Adickes v. Kress</u>)

(Marijuana Bias)

(Defendant CITY OF BROWNSVILLE)

- 31. The foregoing paragraphs are incorporated herein by reference.
- 32. Defendant City has failed to properly train and guide the individual defendants, in their city positions, as either elected officials or hired officials, on how to guarantee the city's residents their constitutional and statutory rights. In this case lawful cannabis dispensary was the sole factor in making these decisions.
- 33. Defendant City is directly liable to plaintiffs for its unconstitutional policies, customs, or practices; and/or for failing to properly train its decision makers, elected and hired.
- 34. As a direct and proximate result of the actions and omissions described in this complaint, plaintiffs incurred damages alleged herein, and were required to hire an attorney

9 - AMENDED COMPLAINT

1	to represent them and is entitled to an award of reasonable attorneys' fees and costs pursuant		
2	to 42 U.S.C. § 1988.		
3	35. Plaintiffs are entitled to a jury trial.		
4	- -		
5	PRAYER FOR RELIEF		
6	WHEREFORE, plaintiffs request a jury trial and demand judgment in their favor and		
7	against defendants for the relief sought herein; future request for punitive damages, for their		
8	reasonable costs and attorney fees; and for any other relief deemed appropriate by the court.		
9			
10	Respectfully submitted September 17, 2019,		
11	Respectionly submitted September 17, 2019,		
12	s/BRIAN MICHAELS BRIAN MICHAELS, OSB 925607		
13			
14	BRIAN MICHAELS, OSB # 925607		
15	259 East Fifth Avenue, Suite 300-D Eugene, Oregon 97401		
16	541-687-0578		
10	Fax 541-686-2137		
17	<u>brian@brianmichaelslaw.com</u>		
18	MARIANNE DUGAN, OSB # 932563		
19	259 E. 5th Avenue, Suite 200-D Eugene, OR 97401		
20	541-338-7072		
21	Fax no. 866-650-5213 mdugan@mdugan.com		
22	Attorneys for Plaintiffs		
23			
24			
25			
26			

City of Brownsville Planning Commission Meeting

Land Use Planning Meeting

Transcribed from CD- Simpson

July 31st, 2017



CC REPORTING AND VIDEOCONFERENCING
172 East 8th Ave
Eugene, OR 97401
541-485-0111
www.ccreporting.com

Case 6:19-cv-01540-IM Document 1-2 Filed 09/24/19 Page 12 of 66

City of Brownsville Planning Commission Meeting Transcribed from CD Simpson July 31, 2017

CITY OF BROWNSVILLE PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING JULY 31, 2017

Notice of Removal Defs' Ex. 2 (12 of 66)

Case 6:19-cv-01540-IM Document 1-2 Filed 09/24/19 Page 13 of 66

City of Brownsville Planning Commission Meeting Transcribed from CD Simpson July 31, 2017

	2
1	COMMISSIONER: We'll go ahead and
2	reconvene this meeting from what date was it last
3	time?
4	COMMISSIONER: July 17th.
5	COMMISSIONER: July 17th. So what I
6	think we'll do is we'll do roll call, do the pledge
7	of allegiance, and then I'll turn it over to Scott
8	to kind of summarize things for us, and then we'll
9	get back into this conditional permit request.
10	ELIZABETH COLEMAN: Commissioner
11	Wyant.
12	COMMISSIONER: Here.
13	ELIZABETH COLEMAN: Commissioner
14	MacDaniel?
15	COMMISSIONER: Here.
16	ELIZABETH COLEMAN: Commissioner
17	Thompson?
18	COMMISSIONER: Here.
19	ELIZABETH COLEMAN: Commissioner
20	Andrews?
21	COMMISSIONER: Here.
22	ELIZABETH COLEMAN: Commissioner
23	Compton?
24	COMMISSIONER: Here.
25	ELIZABETH COLEMAN: Commissioner
	· .

Notice of Removal Defs' Ex. 2 (13 of 66)

Case 6:19-cv-01540-IM Document 1-2 Filed 09/24/19 Page 14 of 66

City of Brownsville Planning Commission Meeting Transcribed from CD Simpson July 31, 2017

```
1
     Wendgren?
 2
                   COMMISSIONER: Here.
 3
                   ELIZABETH COLEMAN: Commissioner
     Kometz?
 4
 5
                   COMMISSIONER: Present.
 6
                   ELIZABETH COLEMAN: And Scott McDowell
 7
     and myself are here. Scott is passing --
 8
                   COMMISSIONER: We'll do the pledge
     first.
 9
10
                   ELIZABETH COLEMAN: Sorry. You're
11
    right.
             I'm ahead of the game.
                   (Crosstalk.)
12
                   (Pledge of Allegiance.)
13
14
                   SCOTT: So welcome to part two of the
    Simpsons' application clarification. I want to talk
15
16
    about what we learned as a result of Mr. MacDaniel's
17
    question and then some procedural things, too, that
    I wanted to address with the planning commission.
18
19
                   So at the last meeting to consider
20
    Simpsons' request for a recreational conditional use
21
    application, the planning commission had a
22
    relatively robust discussion over some of the pros
23
    and cons, how that fit in the plan. There was some
    discussion regarding a variety of issues from
24
25
    federal law to the American Medical Journal
```

1 articles.

Bottom line at the end of the day was Mr. Mike MacDaniel was responding to a question, as was Mr. Brian Wyant, about the part of the municipal code that deals with playgrounds and the thousand foot rule.

Commissioner Compton -- or Chair

Compton attempted to address that question but the question remained unanswered. I had attempted to get ahold of the attorney prior to the meeting, the city attorney. He was on vacation so I wasn't able to clarify that rule.

So basically what the committee did was they had made it through the public portion of the meeting. They went into the discussion portion of the meeting, which was for the commission only. Upon that question being asked, a summary vote was taken to see what it turned out to be. Turned out to be a 3-3 tie.

However, since Mr. MacDaniel had made the motion, and Mr. Wyant, for us to go forth and you guys agreed to go forth for more information, that's why the meeting was tabled so that we could reconvene this evening.

Upon that, (inaudible) some of the

Notice of Removal Defs' Ex. 2 (15 of 66)

Case 6:19-cv-01540-IM Document 1-2 Filed 09/24/19 Page 16 of 66

City of Brownsville Planning Commission Meeting Transcribed from CD Simpson July 31, 2017

information, Mr. Rob Wendgren was not in attendance 1 2 at the last meeting. He is in attendance at this However, did -- Mr. Rob, were you able to 3 come in before five o'clock today and listen to the 4 5 audio recording of the last meeting? 6 COMMISSIONER: No. 7 So Mr. Wendgren will SCOTT: Okay. 8 not be able to participate. So the rule is this: 9 mean, he can -- he can sit here and have a seat, but 10 the rule is, is if you're going to be a voting 11 member on an issue that was heard at a reconvening, you have to come in and listen to the full audio. 12 So that's why Elizabeth was saying, you know, five 13 14 o'clock the day of the meeting you would need to do 15 that. So that's one procedural step. Second procedural step is it is up to 16 17 the planning commission chair, of course, if you want to reopen any public portion of the meeting. 18 Otherwise, we would just get down to business. 19 So -- so getting back down to the 20 21 question from the attorney, I talked to Ross Williamson at Speer Hoyt. I brought up the 22 23 question. Chapter 15.111 marijuana uses. As we 24 were in that chapter, under zoning and conditions of 25 approval which we're talking about, paragraph B1(c)

6

says within 1,000 feet of a public park, playground, 1 2 recreational facility, or athletic field. 3 However, in paragraph C, it clarifies what that means. In paragraph C3 it indicates a 4 public park, playground, recreational facility, or 5 athletic field, means a park, playground, 6 7 recreational facility, or athletic field that is owned or operated by a government entity or a nonprofit organization and that is open to the 9 general public excluding mini parks or pocket parks 10 as defined in the City's master park plan. 11 So the reason why the City attorney 12 and, of course, they were doing this in real-time 13 when we were going through the land use with no 14 precedents or anything, right, they were taking a 15 16 look at how do we keep our clients out of litigation on marijuana issues. 17 They ruled that -- not just in our 18 case but in many cases that they dealt with in their 19 clients -- that the City's -- the City's park master 20 plan, as approved and adopted by the Council, is a 21 22 stand alone document, so it is a stand alone document that has bearing, so those are the 23 definitions that were used. 24 25 In the City's park master plan,

Blakely Park is considered a pocket park. 1 2 though there's a playground there, right, even 3 though it's within 1,000 feet or roughly 640 feet, plus or minus, its still, by definition, qualifies 5 as an eligible place to locate a marijuana business. And for the sake of this argument --6 7 for the sake of conditional uses that we were able to do at the time, marijuana uses include medical 8 9 and recreational. So to answer your question, Mike, it 10 11 does meet the code under those series of definitions. 12 I asked the rationale for the 13 attorney. He said basically what we were trying to 14 do at that time, and he said, "I still stand behind 15 it today." He said, you never want -- you're not 16 17 allowed by the revised statute to zone a use out --18 you can't zone a use out. And so, in effect, if we would have done time place and manner, and we would 19 20 have zoned not just the Simpsons but anyone wanting to do marijuana, out of our community, then they 21 would have a legal grounds to actually come against 22 the City with a lawsuit. 23 So, you know, of course their number 24 25 one priority is to avoid that, and so that's why

Notice of Removal Defs' Ex. 2 (18 of 66)

Case 6:19-cv-01540-IM Document 1-2 Filed 09/24/19 Page 19 of 66

City of Brownsville Planning Commission Meeting Transcribed from CD Simpson July 31, 2017

1 that came down that way. So hopefully that provides 2 enough clarity on that issue. I know that it's -you know, it's a bit of a semantics issue because it 3 is a playground, and I totally see your point, 4 5 Commissioner Wyant. So that's what I've got, though, in terms of answering that specific 6 7 question. 8 Is there anything else you wanted me 9 to do? Oh, I will, though. I will, though. So in matter of procedure. So basically what Chair 10 11 Compton will do moments from now is he will reopen the discussion between the commissioners and the 12 commissioners will be able to vote, save Mr. Rob, on 13 14 the topic. 15 Basically what would happen at that 16 point, if the vote ends this time in 3-3 tie, a 3-3 17 vote is a denial. What happens at that point is the 18 applicant, Mr. and Mrs. Simpson -- Ashford and Simpson -- would be able to appeal that decision to 19 20 the City Council. 21 Basically how that works procedurally 22 is within 15 days of the notice of decision, which I 23 think there's a timeline we have there, we've got

> Notice of Removal Defs' Ex. 2 (19 of 66)

five days to get the notice and decision out, they

would have 15 days upon receipt of that notice of

24

Case 6:19-cv-01540-IM Document 1-2 Filed 09/24/19 Page 20 of 66

City of Brownsville Planning Commission Meeting Transcribed from CD Simpson July 31, 2017

```
decision to let us know if they would like to appeal
 1
 2
     that decision to the City Council. And then the
 3
     City Council would hear the exact same presentation
     and make a determination at that meeting.
 5
                   So that's procedurally what would
 6
     happen if it ends in a tie.
 7
                   So with that, Chair Compton, I will
     throw it back to you unless there are any other
 8
 9
     questions.
10
                   COMMISSIONER: Okay.
                                          Thank you,
11
     Scott.
12
                   SCOTT:
                           Sure.
13
                   COMMISSIONER: And right now, unless
14
    other people have a need to reopen the public
     portion --
15
                   UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: I have a
16
17
    question to ask the Simpsons.
18
                   COMMISSIONER: We'll right now that
    portion is closed. What would the question be
19
20
    around?
                   UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER:
21
                                                  But
22
    you'd have the ability to reopen it.
23
                   COMMISSIONER: Yeah, but I think we
    can discuss what it is.
24
                                                  I wanted
25
                   UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER:
```

Notice of Removal Defs' Ex. 2 (20 of 66)

10

```
clarification (inaudible) a better understanding --
 1
 2
     a better remembrance for me --
 3
                   COMMISSIONER:
                                   Okay.
 4
                   UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: -- of
 5
     what the OLCC planning (inaudible) a year from now.
     Because that will be (inaudible) they alluded to
 6
 7
     that, that there were changes coming, and they had
     to be in place she thought, by July of 2018, that
 8
     it's going to be mandated.
 9
10
                   That's my remembrance but I need to be
     clear on that, because that could affect my view of
11
     this.
12
13
                   COMMISSIONER: Yeah. Well -- and that
    was something I was going to discuss as well, so
14
15
    maybe what we'll do is -- I'll share kind of where
16
     I'm at, you share what your ideas or concerns are,
17
    and then after we discuss it, and -- then maybe the
    commission will have some pointed questions to ask
18
    them.
19
20
                   UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER:
                                                  Yeah, I
    just don't want to be wrong and rely on my memory
21
22
    and have it be incorrect.
23
                   COMMISSIONER: Well, the other thing
    that I think that (inaudible) I have is -- I mean,
24
25
    I'm sure they are doing their best to report to us
```

```
1
     their understanding of changes but (inaudible) their
 2
     description of what their understanding is as fact.
 3
                   UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER:
     understanding (inaudible) --
 4
 5
                   COMMISSIONER: Yeah.
 6
                   UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER:
                                                 Which --
 7
     from the OLCC, which would be pretty --
 8
                   ELIZABETH COLEMAN:
                                       And you can ask
 9
    questions of the applicant at this time. Just so
10
    that you know, you can ask questions.
                                             It's part --
11
    it's still part of the process.
                   COMMISSIONER: But it's not if it's
12
13
    closed.
14
                   ELIZABETH COLEMAN: Well, you can
    reopen that portion of it.
15
16
                   COMMISSIONER:
                                  Oh, yeah, yeah.
17
    the question is on the OLCC information.
                                                Do you
18
    quys have access to that or have you read it?
19
    mean, the Simpsons, last time, were talking about
20
    the changes coming with what they were told.
21
    that match your understanding or was that new
22
    information to you? I just don't want to take that
23
    as fact.
24
                   MS. ASHFORD: That was somewhat new
25
    information, and I actually have a call into the
```

```
OLCC on some clarifying piece for that, which is-
 1
 2
                   COMMISSIONER: I guess I'm just real
 3
    hesitant to take their interpretation of a confusing
    situation up there as fact for us to use as a basis
 4
 5
    of fact for our finding and discussion.
                   UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER:
 6
                                               Well, I
 7
    think that OLCC probably has every intention of
 8
    doing that but we don't know really, honestly --
 9
    again, this whole situation has been so fluid and
    ever changing. You know, I'm sure that OLCC intends
10
11
    to do those things, but whether or not they will be
    able to and who knows what will happen in terms
12
    of -- there's a lot of folks who are upset about
13
    certain applications. Who knows what's going to
14
    happen at the next legislative session and so forth.
15
                   COMMISSIONER: So -- yeah.
16
                                               So I think
17
    that reminds me. It seems like last time we just
18
    decided, well, we just need to kind of base it on
    what the law is today.
19
20
                   UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER:
                                                 And that
21
    could be reopened in a year or whenever that change
22
    is.
23
                   COMMISSIONER:
                                  Yeah, yeah. Let's talk
    about it some more and then we'll see where we're at
24
25
    after the discussion. There may be other questions
```

1 and then we can open it. Does that make sense? 2 ELIZABETH COLEMAN: Yeah. Sure. COMMISSIONER: Well, I will go ahead 3 4 and just -- I want to hear from everyone what their 5 position is or if they've had additional thoughts or any ideas for further discussion. 6 7 What Trish is bringing up that I also 8 want to disclose, I quess, probably -- I think it 9 does fall under ex parte communication or (inaudible) -- I'm not sure. But actually, there is 10 11 a -- when I got home, I called up Don and asked him 12 if he had some time to read this first paragraph and 13 see if he kind of came up with any new 14 interpretations of that paragraph other than what I 15 had presented in the meeting. 16 And then Brian and I had a brief 17 conversation. He was just -- being a new 18 commissioner, he was just asking me if he thought --19 was asking me if his position on the parks was out 20 of line for his role as a commissioner, and I told 21 him I did not think so, that I supported his opinion and that he was attempting to interpret the 22 ordinances and the rules and make a decision based 23 24 on -- you know, making a decision based on that, and 25 that was the decision he had made. So I told him I

```
thought he was within the bounds of his role.
 1
 2
                   And then Trish emailed me and asked
 3
    me, Gary, if we were to have a conditional use where
     edibles were not part of the business, is that
 4
 5
     something you would consider?
 6
                   And I wrote back that that's also
 7
     something I thought of and it would be something I
 8
    would consider but would have to look at the
 9
    research again about how much of an impact that has.
10
                   TRISH: And I think I said would it
11
     change your view.
12
                   COMMISSIONER:
                                  Yeah.
13
                   TRISH: I didn't ask you to change
    your decision.
14
15
                   COMMISSIONER:
                                  No.
                   TRISH: I said would it change your
16
17
    view.
18
                   COMMISSIONER:
                                  Right. And I said
    possibly based on -- after I have reviewed the
19
20
    research. So -- and then I got an email from
21
    Scott -- not to leave Scott out.
22
                   SCOTT:
                           Right.
23
                   COMMISSIONER: Informing us to be --
    up dating us on some of the rules but also stating
24
25
    that it's important, with an issue like this, not to
```

```
1
     -- we've got to be careful about talking about it in
 2
     public and talking to friends and family and
 3
     communicating at length with even other
     commissioners so . . .
 4
 5
                   SCOTT: Yeah.
                                  And I do want to say
 6
     thank you to the commissioners. I thought that,
 7
     given the circumstances, you handled the situation
 8
     as best you could. A very difficult situation.
    Obviously been a point of conversation in our
 9
10
    community for a number of years at this point.
11
    yes, you've got to be careful of ex parte contacts.
                   Anytime a meeting is -- is tabled as
12
    such, especially when it's a quasijudicial hearing
13
14
    like the planning commission, staff are really the
15
    only people that are safe to talk to in terms of ex
16
    parte contact. So since you've listed the ones,
17
    you're doing a great job there.
18
                   So it's just a good learning curve for
    future situations when you're tabled. I mean, even
19
    if we were -- I know we're going to have one that's
20
21
    possibly contentious coming up, so that's just --
    it's a point of order to remember for future.
22
23
                   COMMISSIONER: And then just to -- to
24
    continue the conversation that Trish brought up
25
    tonight was that -- I guess I am open to considering
```

approving the request with the condition that
edibles not be sold, and that's based on the
research that showed that 52 percent of the
hospitalizations -- I know Rob hasn't read this, but
the research was talking about increase in calls to
poison control and to the hospital when Colorado
moved from medical to recreational.

So the edible products seemed to be responsible for 52 percent of the exposures, so to me, that's pretty significant. And kind of going back to this paragraph that, you know, I was quoting up here, you know, it's weighing out the -- any of the concerns or harm against the benefits, the desirability of it.

So I am open to doing that, and I want to hear where everybody else is at with the park issue and federal concerns. (Inaudible).

COMMISSIONER: Well, to me, the park was never an issue because I thought it was a pocket park from the beginning, and so I wasn't concerned about that. The thing I keep going back to is all these years we've been told and we have been trying to use four criteria in determining whether or not there should be a conditional use. These are the things we're supposed to use. We're not supposed to

17

1 use our personal feelings, outside evidence, 2 discussions from the community, how the people voted or anything. We're supposed to use these four 3 criteria period. 4 And I think in order for me to be 5 consistent, regardless of whether it's marijuana, 6 7 alcohol, guns, or whatever, I still have to use the 8 same four criteria regardless of my personal feelings about it because we have to be consistent 9 10 and treat everybody the same. So I read these four criteria 11 consistent with the applicable policies of the 12 comprehensive plan, and then they list A through N 13 14 on that -- this is on page 6 of the staff report. So the first criteria we have to be 15 concerned about is is it consistent with the 16 17 applicable policies in the comprehensive plan, and they list all of those. The only one I can see 18 19 where there's even any question whatsoever is B. That's the one that talks about adversely impacting, 20 21 which is your situation. All the rest of them have to do with plumbing, water, everything else, which 22 fits. 2.3 24 So going through this so far, the only 25 thing I had is this adversely impact the surrounding

```
1
    uses.
 2
                   You look at the second criteria, it
 3
    doesn't -- I mean, we don't have to worry about the
    location, size, the design, and operating
 5
    characteristics of the proposal. We don't have to
    worry about the location, the size, design,
 6
 7
    operating characteristics. That's not a concern.
8
    So it fits that.
                   We look at the third criteria,
 9
    preserve those historical, archeological, natural,
10
11
    and scenic assets. We're not concerned with that,
    so that's a yes.
12
                   Then the fourth one -- where did it
13
    go? Does not place an excessive burden on streets,
14
    sewage, water supply, (inaudible) system, et cetera,
15
    so we're not concerned with that.
16
17
                   So the only thing that I can see that
    we're even concerned about is B, whether or not it
18
    meets the -- that meets B of the first criteria.
19
20
    Will the proposed development adversely impact the
    surrounding areas? And that seems to be, as far as
21
22
    I'm concerned anyway, the only issue that we need to
    worry about.
23
                   And I can't see that it's going to
24
25
    adversely impact the surrounding uses.
                                              It's that
```

```
So my conclusion is the same as staff
 1
     simple.
 2
     (inaudible) when they recommend this, so that's the
    way I looked at it. It's very complicated, so I had
 3
    to try to simplify it in my own mind using the
 4
    paperwork from the City to figure out what to do,
 5
    and that's what I came up with.
 6
 7
                   We got 10 or 12 pages of paperwork
 8
    here, and it's all very good, it's all very good
    with the background. But when you sift the wheat
 9
    from the chaff, we have this one straw: Will
10
    proposed development adversely impact the
11
    surrounding uses?
12
                   That seems to be the question.
13
    answer to that is yes, then we should vote against
14
         If the answer to that is no, then we should
15
16
    vote for it.
                   That's the way I see it.
17
                   COMMISSIONER: Yeah.
                                         I hear what
    you're saying, and I quess -- and I know you like a
18
    good discussion (inaudible).
19
                   I think one of the things that we --
20
    conclusion we also came to last time is that staff
21
    or Liz or maybe her predecessor came up with this
22
23
    format, but what I did is I went to the City
    ordinances that list what we're supposed to be
24
25
    doing. And I know this is throwing a monkey wrench
```

```
into what we've done for the last 12 years I've been
 1
 2
    here -- but I sat down and read this word for word,
    and it states in here that in addition to those four
 3
     things, before we do the four things, which is
 4
 5
     (inaudible) "In judging whether or not a conditional
    use proposal shall be approved or denied, the
 6
 7
    planning commission shall weigh the appropriateness
 8
    and desirability for the public convenience or
 9
    necessity to be served against any adverse
    conditions that would result from authorizing the
10
    particular development at that location and those
11
    four things listed below."
12
                   So anyway, that is not in staff's
13
              Since I've been here, that has not been
14
    report.
15
    listed as something that we have addressed.
                   I discovered that, and then that's
16
17
    kind of what I'm basing -- in part, basing my
    position on. So I know I'm throwing a monkey wrench
18
    into things, because I do see, from the research
19
    I've read, that recreational marijuana can cause a
20
21
    significant increase in accidental -- unintentional
    poisonings to young children. So anyway --
22
23
                   COMMISSIONER: You know, I agree with
    you, that's kind of a monkey wrench because that
24
    standard has never been enforced before that I'm
25
```

```
1
     aware of.
                                  Right.
 2
                   COMMISSIONER:
                   COMMISSIONER: And -- but I would --
 3
 4
     over the last however many years -- we've been
 5
     applying these other four standards. In all
 6
     fairness to these folks, I think we need to use the
 7
     same standards on them that we've used on everybody
     else for the past 20 years. And somehow, then, once
 8
 9
     we get through this proceeding, we need to figure
    out how to shoehorn all this in through the Council
10
    or whatever as to what's going to happen in the
11
12
     future.
13
                   But I don't think we should throw it
14
     in now in this proceeding when it's never been
    thrown in before.
15
                        That's what I'm objecting to, not
16
    necessarily your interpretation of it, but the
17
    process of using it now when we have never used it
18
    before.
19
                   SCOTT:
                           Okay.
                                  There's a couple things
20
    here I need to jump in for clarification purposes.
21
    It has always been there. It's just never been a
22
    criteria that you guys have used.
                   COMMISSIONER: Are we supposed to use
23
    it?
24
25
                   SCOTT: You can use whatever you want
```

```
based on the facts. So talking to the attorney
 1
 2
     about this particular issue -- because when I talked
     with the attorney, I wanted to talk about several
 3
     things -- of course you can use that criteria should
 4
 5
     you choose. The strength of the argument is
     where -- it's questionable.
 6
 7
                   One of the things that he pointed out
 8
     was, very simply, adverse -- adverse conditions.
    How do you prove adverse conditions and what are you
 9
     going to cite for those adverse conditions? And --
10
     and it's a scale situation.
11
12
                   COMMISSIONER: It's very subjective.
13
                   SCOTT: Well, it is. So the scale is
14
     in each of your minds and your scale is do you feel
    that it's going to -- the benefit is going to out
15
    weigh the potential adverse conditions, or do you
16
17
     feel that the adverse conditions outweigh the
    potential benefits of whatever use it is?
18
19
                   So I know that doesn't clarify it
    much, but -- but what I'm saying is, is that is also
20
21
    part of the crux or criteria that anyone on any
22
    planning commission can use to make their point or
23
    validate their argument. So good discussion,
24
    though.
25
                                  I think just take the
                   COMMISSIONER:
```

1 monkey wrench out (inaudible) that just causes 2 problems. But we historically have been very 3 careful about precedent in trying to be fair to all the applicants. So maybe I can approach this in a 4 5 different way and that is -- like when we were looking at the coffee roaster -- I brought this up 6 7 last time -- is we spent a lot of time being very concerned about the smell of the roasting coffee 8 9 impacting neighbors or surrounding uses, and we've 10 done so with the dog grooming and the dog housing, 11 whether it's going to be parking or quite possibly a 12 child sticks their hand through the fence 13 (inaudible), you know, concern how it impacts the 14 neighbors. 15 I guess I'm just saying that if they 16 are selling the research and that where it comes 17 down to what the attorney said about having some 18 type of empirical standards, that's what I brought, 19 and it shows that if you have recreational 20 marijuana, the children that live in surrounding 21 areas, the increase of poison control calls goes up 22 five times and hospital is twice in Colorado, the 23 only known area that has this. 24 So anyway -- so if we just look at 25 precedent, I'm looking at the impact this is going

to have on those people that are living in the other 1 2 areas, just like the coffee smell and the dog smell, 3 so maybe take it from that approach and weigh it 4 that way. You still may not weigh out, but I'll take this first part out of this. 5 SCOTT: And when Liz and I considered 6 7 the staff report with Dave Kinney, that's the whole 8 purpose of a conditional use. The whole purpose of 9 a conditional use is to look at the angles and to 10 allay those concerns. Like, as an example, just to clarify -- I know we've got folks in the audience 11 12 that don't understand -- I'm just going to dig a little deeper. I'm just going to just use one of 13 your examples on the dog kennel. 14 15 So we had a dog kennel/dog grooming 16 business, a couple of them, that had opened up in town, and basically what the planning commission did 17 is said -- they said, Hey, look, we're going to 18 allow this conditional use for the period of one 19 20 year. At the end of one year, we're going to take a 21 look at the complaints in the area, what was the 22 impact on the neighbors, did the dogs bark? 23 they distracting? Did they disturb the peace? 24 were the impacts to the community? 25 And that's why staff was suggesting

```
those types of pieces are absolutely legitimate to
 1
 2
    consider during a conditional use.
 3
                   COMMISSIONER: And that's why Trish
    and I -- what we're talking about is that given that
 4
    edibles are not sold, that could dramatically
 5
    increase the negative impact on the environment and
 6
 7
    that's, I assume, a condition we can put on it, so
 8
    I'm just open to that.
                   COMMISSIONER: Well, our concern with
 9
    the dogs and the coffee was -- we said if it bothers
10
    anybody -- we're going to give you the use on both
11
    of them, and if it bothers anybody, we're going to
12
    come back and take a look at it. That's not what
13
    we're doing here.
14
                           Well, it could be.
15
                   SCOTT:
                                               You're not
16
    to that point yet, Commissioner Andrews.
17
                   COMMISSIONER: What Gary is saying is
    I don't want to give them the use because there's
18
    evidence from other states that says that will
19
             That's the difference.
20
    happen.
                   SCOTT: Okay. Well, I think you need
21
    to get a vote to where you got to the part where
22
23
    your putting conditions on there. So continue your
    discussion. We don't want to get to the cart before
24
25
    the horse.
```

```
UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER:
                                                 My view
 1
 2
    would be -- as a suggestion -- as a suggestion --
    that we grant conditional use that they be allowed
 3
    to sell the recreational marijuana with the
 4
    exception of edibles. And the conditional use is no
 5
    edibles. You can sell recreational, however -- in
 6
    whatever form it is, but you cannot sell edibles.
 7
                   The impact on finances and that sort
    of thing, I have not a clue, but that's not my job
 9
    to figure out how that would pan out for them
10
                   It's just -- if that's a concern that
    financially.
11
    we have, then that would be one way to address it.
12
    And it doesn't mean -- it doesn't not [sic] mean,
13
    Scott, that they could come back in a year or two
14
    and say we have this conditional use and we would
15
    like it reviewed and revised?
16
17
                   SCOTT: Actually, if I can interject,
    we did anticipate this being a possibility.
18
                   COMMISSIONER:
                                  Okay.
19
                   SCOTT:
                           Sorry. Just one second.
                                                      I've
20
    got people all over the place tonight.
21
                   So here is the deal with that.
22
    sorry. Here is the deal with that. So if the
23
    applicant would voluntarily agree that they wouldn't
24
    have edibles, but you cannot require it.
25
```

```
27
```

```
1
                   COMMISSIONER: You can't require it?
 2
                   SCOTT:
                           No. No.
                                      If they would agree
 3
     to it, that's one thing. But you cannot require
     that as a conditional use.
 4
 5
                   COMMISSIONER:
                                   Why not?
 6
                   COMMISSIONER:
                                   Why not?
                                             Because we
 7
     can -- you have to have a filter. You can roast
     coffee. You have to have a filter.
 8
                                           What's
 9
     different about this? I don't understand that.
10
                   SCOTT:
                           They just said, no, you can't
11
     do it.
12
                   COMMISSIONER:
                                   Who said no?
13
                   SCOTT:
                           The city attorney.
14
                   (Crosstalk.)
15
                   MR. SIMPSON:
                                 Is there any way I could
16
     say something here?
17
                   COMMISSIONER:
                                  No.
                                        It's a closed.
18
                   (Crosstalk.)
19
                   UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER:
20
    didn't clarify?
21
                   SCOTT: You were on the conference
22
    call, too.
                 Basically, he said that there are
    conditions that you can place upon a business or a
23
24
    potential business use, and then there's ones that
25
    have to be -- that have to be voluntary.
                                                And he
```

```
indicated that other shops are allowed to have every
 1
 2
     type of product, and this would be an undue -- it's
 3
     an undue condition.
                   But, he said, if they voluntarily did
 4
 5
     that -- basically the bottom line was typically
 6
     commissions can't do it, but if they voluntarily
 7
     agree that they would do that, then can you can put
     it as a condition.
 8
 9
                   COMMISSIONER: Okay. So Gary
     (inaudible) talk about the concern of children as it
10
     related to edibles?
11
                   COMMISSIONER: Yeah, yeah. You mean
12
    which -- it broke it down into that 9 percent was
13
    due to the product not being in a child-resistant
14
    container, and 40 scenarios were poor child
15
16
    supervision or product storage was the issue, and
17
    the edible products were responsible for 51
    exposures, or 52 percent.
18
19
                   COMMISSIONER:
                                  That was for poor
20
    supervision.
                   Right?
21
                   COMMISSIONER: How do you govern
22
    against that?
                   COMMISSIONER: No, you can't, and
23
24
    that's why I think that the idea of edibles, I mean,
25
    it knocks out the biggest --
```

```
1
                   COMMISSIONER: It's not the fact that
 2
     they are selling edibles. It's just the parents put
     them where the kids can get at them?
 3
 4
                   COMMISSIONER: And this was the other
 5
     part --
 6
                   COMMISSIONER:
                                   Okay.
 7
                   COMMISSIONER: So there was the --
 8
     well, obviously, if there's edibles, they left it
     out.
 9
10
                   COMMISSIONER:
                                   Yeah.
11
                   COMMISSIONER:
                                   Yeah.
12
                   COMMISSIONER: So I know I don't get
     to vote because I didn't know that we had to listen
13
14
     to the tapes, that's my fault, but I did spend a lot
15
    of time thinking about this because -- so I had some
16
     thoughts here, and I don't know if they pertain
17
    here.
                   Speaking of -- the first one was the
18
    criteria of what we have to decide on here and, you
19
20
    know, you go to boilerplate, well, you know, it's so
21
     far from the streets and all the nuts and bolts --
                   SCOTT: Well -- actually -- actually,
22
    Rob, I'm going -- I don't even think you are allowed
23
24
    to participate because you weren't at the first part
25
    of the hearing.
```

1	COMMISSIONER: Really?
2	SCOTT: Yeah.
3	COMMISSIONER: I don't even have to be
4	here?
5	SCOTT: Well, that's true. That's
6	true. But you're here. I mean, you know, it's one
7	of those things that from a procedural standpoint
8	COMMISSIONER: So I could speak in the
9	public part?
10	SCOTT: You could. You could go out
11	there, and if they open if they open up and
12	recognize the public, you can certainly do that.
13	COMMISSIONER: Okay.
14	SCOTT: Yes. But as an acting
15	commissioner, I have to I have to stop that. I
16	apologize.
17	COMMISSIONER: So take a motion back
18	up?
19	COMMISSIONER: Yes.
20	COMMISSIONER: Okay. I move that we
21	reopen this for more public testimony.
22	COMMISSIONER: Okay. I kind of want
23	to go through and have everybody I just feel like
24	we've kind of hogged it. I want to get to Mike and
25	Brian and then we'll open up. Is that okay?

```
COMMISSIONER: Sure.
                                         I'll hold my
 1
 2
     motion then until --
                   COMMISSIONER:
                                  That way we'll get to
 3
    hear everything. Mike, what are your thoughts?
 4
                   COMMISSIONER: There was a whole lot
 5
    more going on over this last week than when I first
 6
 7
    came in thinking (inaudible) what we were doing.
 8
    And I'm really having -- I'm having some problems
    with, you know, adverse conditions, you know, and
 9
10
    the actual value of property around the facility.
11
    know I would not buy a home next to or that close to
    a facility.
12
                   So I listened to what everybody has
13
    been saying.
                  Everybody has valid, you know,
14
    arguments. I mean, there's some good things and
15
    some bad things. I know the City needs revenue, but
16
17
    how bad do they need the revenue?
                   But at this point I've changed my mind
18
    from last week, Scott. I'm really not in favor of
19
    selling recreational marijuana in Brownsville.
20
21
                   COMMISSIONER:
                                  Okay.
                                         Brian?
                   COMMISSIONER:
                                  I'm still right where I
22
23
    was before. I still, you know -- I know the
    attorney said this and this and this about the park,
24
    but still, children play in it. We're 600 feet
25
```

```
away, and we can put whatever label we want on it.
 1
     I mean, we have to think about this. This is
 2
 3
    against -- I mean, granted, the State of Oregon
    passed it, but we're doing something that's against
 4
 5
    federal law here, and I just -- I just can't vote
 6
    yes.
 7
                   COMMISSIONER:
                                  Okay.
                                        Thanks, Brian.
 8
                   COMMISSIONER: My position still
9
    stands with the adversely affecting the neighbors,
    property values, included in that, so --
10
11
                   COMMISSIONER:
                                  Okay. All right.
                                                      All
12
    those in favor to open up to public opinion --
13
                   COMMISSIONER: Don't you want my
    opinion?
14
15
                   COMMISSIONER:
                                  I thought you had --
                   COMMISSIONER:
                                  Shocked and appalled.
16
                   COMMISSIONER:
17
                                  I'm sorry.
                                  Well, I asked
18
                   COMMISSIONER:
    questions.
19
20
                   COMMISSIONER:
                                  Yes.
                                         I'm sorry you
21
    didn't make a formal statement. (Inaudible).
22
                   COMMISSIONER: You're back pedaling
    now. Okay, so -- so are we actually doing a re-vote
23
    or we're just finishing a discussion? We're just
24
25
    getting final discussion points?
```

```
COMMISSIONER:
                                  Yeah.
 1
 2
                   COMMISSIONER:
                                  Is that what I'm
 3
    understanding?
                   COMMISSIONER:
                                  Yeah.
 4
 5
                   COMMISSIONER:
                                  Then I quess I do thank
    you, but I guess I pretty much asked the questions
 6
 7
    and Scott really clarified. I wasn't aware we
 8
    couldn't do a conditional use permit based on not
 9
    selling edibles so, you know, that was good --
    that's important information for me to have.
10
11
                   I also think that -- you know, I
    don't, I don't use marijuana medically,
12
13
    recreationally, or anything, but I think we err if
    we try to overregulate.
14
                   And when you can go to Corvallis,
15
    Albany, Lebanon, Sweet Home -- I don't know where
16
17
    all else they have -- and bring edibles back here,
    you know, just because you buy it -- don't buy it in
18
    Brownsville doesn't mean that you don't have the
19
    same risks to children and the same negligent
20
    parents who -- you know, they have it in the house
21
22
    and they are not treating it as the drug that it is
23
    or having the effect that it does on children.
                   And I think there's a limit to what we
24
25
    can try and regulate. And I -- I just feel that
```

```
they have met the conditions. They have done what
 1
     the City has -- (inaudible) questions. And I
 2
    absolutely agree, we can't go back and suddenly
 3
    change 12 years of history and decide to put in
 4
    another criteria. That's not fair to anybody
 5
    anywhere. We need to finish this out and then
 6
 7
    revisit that and alter it if that's what we deem
 8
    needs to be done. But we have to use the same
    criteria that we've been using for the last 12
 9
10
    years.
                   And if you look through this, the four
11
    points that the City made, and as far as I'm
12
    concerned, they have -- personal opinion aside --
13
14
    they have met the criteria required for this
    conditional use, so I stand with my original
15
    position, and that is to vote for it.
16
17
                   COMMISSIONER:
                                  Okay.
                                         Thank you.
    those in favor of opening up to public discussion?
18
    Looks unanimous.
19
                       Okay.
                   The applicants can go ahead and speak
20
21
    if you'd like.
22
                   MR. SIMPSON: Thank you. I came to
    this meeting two weeks ago thinking this was just
23
    going to be just a rubber stamp procedure.
24
25
    met all the requirements, and my feeling is based on
```

the State -- or the vote that we had last November that says the State says you have to let -- let a dispensary open up if the majority of voters say yes, and they did.

So this whole discussion to me seems

very, very irrelevant to what's going on other than what Dan or Don and Trish had said. They are spot on. I applaud what you're saying because we meet the requirements and the voters in Brownsville said yes. We won by three votes. We got the majority. If we would have lost by three votes, this meeting wouldn't be here. You wouldn't say, well, it's so close. Well, we might revisit this. No.

As far as edibles go, there are a lot of people that don't like to smoke it, a lot of people. Especially the older generations, they don't smoke, period. And they take tinctures, they take edibles responsibly.

How much -- how many news stories have we seen in the Democrat Herald lately about people in Albany, Corvallis, Lebanon, Sweet Home -- not Sweet Home yet. They are going recreational -- how many news stories have you seen in the last month about local people in those towns getting -- their children going to the hospital? If it happened, it

```
would be all over the paper. I haven't even seen
 1
 2
    one since recreational has gone legal in this area.
                   So this discussion you're having is
 3
    really bothering me because I feel that it's totally
 4
 5
     irrelevant. We meet all the requirements.
                   And -- and the State says you have to
 6
 7
    allow it somewhere in Brownsville. That's the law.
    Right, Scott?
 8
 9
                   SCOTT: Yes.
                   MR. SIMPSON:
10
                                 Okay.
11
                   SCOTT:
                           That's what they say, yes.
                   MR. SIMPSON:
                                 That's all I'm going to
12
    say right now. Thank you.
13
                   MS. ASHFORD: We could be selling
14
    edibles right now and who would know the difference
15
    medically? Medical edibles are twice as strong as
16
17
    recreational which could mean that any child that
    got their hands on a medical edible would be in
18
    twice as bad of shape. Recreational edibles are
19
20
    half as strong.
21
                   These items -- I called the OLCC, by
22
    the way.
               They are not sold in gummy bear shapes or
23
    wormy shapes or attractive candy shapes. They are
    in little adult-looking things.
                                      They are in
24
25
    packages that I can't even hardly open. Anybody
```

```
that's leaving stuff like this around for a child to
 1
 2
     get ahold of is an irresponsible adult, and they
     should not be allowed to purchase those items.
 3
                   Somebody like us who are responsible
 4
     and are following all guidelines, local and state,
 5
     should not be punished for someone else's
 6
 7
     irresponsible actions for their children.
 8
                   I never let my children get their
 9
    hands on any product like that. I never let my
     children have alcohol, which is much more readily
10
11
     available, easy, easy, easier for children, and much
12
    more deadly.
                   So we could be selling edibles right
13
14
          Nobody would know the difference. It's
15
    perfectly legal under the medical license that we
    possess. So then what's the difference selling
16
    medical from recreational?
17
                   Well, number one, a medical license
18
    holder only has to be 18 years of age to come into
19
    our dispensary. Recreational, you have to be 21 or
20
21
    older. The packaging is the same. The strength is
    half for the product.
22
23
                   The OLCC is extremely strict. They
    are much stricter than the medical by far. And it's
24
25
    all going OLCC, so this is going to be even more
```

1 closely regulated. 2 There has to be reasonable zoning in 3 the City of Brownsville, and you all know that, so by restricting us by either a pocket park or by what we sell is basically restricting us and is going to 5 result in an expensive lawsuit against the City of 6 Brownsville. And I'm not threatening anyone. 7 just stating a fact. 8 We've been putting up with this for 9 three and a half years, and I've had enough. 10 not being reasonable here. And we are perfectly 11 willing to follow quidelines that are set forth by 12 Brownsville, and we've bent over backwards to do so. 13 And we've met all the State criteria, which is 14 extensive and extremely strict. And we are the 15 model -- I talked to them, and they said that as far 16 as our bookkeeping goes and all of our recordkeeping 17 goes and keeping track of all of our product that we 18 sell, we are head and shoulders above anyone else in 19 the state right now. So you should be proud of what 20 We're closing down the black market. 21 we're doing. 22 I've heard that from people on the street that have come in and said, "You're doing it. 23 This is what you set out to do and your 24 25 accomplishing it. You're basically shutting down

```
sources for children to get their hands on these
 1
 2
    products in our community, and thank you." I've
 3
    been told that.
                   So you should be ashamed of yourselves
 4
     for putting this type of restriction on people like
 5
 6
    us when we are trying our best to help our
 7
    community.
 8
                   COMMISSIONER: Okay. Anybody else
 9
    like to speak in favor of the application?
                   COMMISSIONER: I don't know if I'm in
10
11
    favor, per se, but I guess I will.
                   COMMISSIONER: You can take a neutral
12
    position.
13
                   COMMISSIONER: Name and address,
14
    serial number.
15
                   COMMISSIONER:
16
                                  It's the whole process.
17
                   COMMISSIONER: Just for the record, go
18
    ahead and state your name and address, please, Rob.
                   COMMISSIONER: (Inaudible) City
19
20
    Councilor, planning commission member. Nonvoting at
    this time.
21
22
                   So I do apologize for missing the last
    meeting. I had a family emergency. Father-in-law
23
    broke his hip. Had to take off in a rush, so I
24
25
    apologize for that.
```

I just spent a lot of time thinking 1 about this and, you know, researching it back and 2 forth to see the pros and cons of all of this. 3 4 One of the things -- and Don kind of touched on it -- the criteria that we're supposed to 5 be using to do this. A lot of the criteria is just 6 very black and white. You know, are the setbacks 7 right? Is the utilities right? Is the hedging 8 right? Blah, blah, blah. 9 You know, the nuts and bolts criteria 10 we look at, it all comes down to, as you say, very 11 subjective. Is it an asset to the community? Is it 12 a (inaudible) to the community? 13 So that's that kind of nebulous thing 14 that everyone is pulling in their personal opinions 15 to make this decision, which is probably what they 16 are supposed to be doing. But, you know, it is a 17 personal opinion that everyone is pulling in here 18 instead of, you know, sitting down and reading 19 paragraph 3B and saying, yes, it matches that, it 20 matches that, it matches that. 21 As Don has said, it covers all of them 22 23 except for do you like it or do you not like it? 24 quess that's what it comes down to. 25 One of the things I did look up and

say the majority of the Oregon voters approved it 1 2 and the majority of the Brownsville voters did approve it, and so that really -- I mean, it sounds 3 like the vote is going to fail here since 4 5 (inaudible) no on it. It's going to go to the City Council, where it should go anyway. You know, let 6 the City Council earn their money and do what they 7 are supposed to do here. I mean, whether we give it 8 9 a blessing or not a blessing, it's probably going to end up there anyway. So I don't know (inaudible), 10 11 but it's going to end up at the City Council and they are obviously going to have to make another 12 decision on that. 13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

responsibility in recreational and the edibles as you talk about. You know, it does come down to a responsible parent. It doesn't matter what kind of medication you have with kids, Vicodin or Miller Light, you know. If you're not a responsible adult and you don't -- and you abuse it -- you know, there's a thousand vices out there in the world that can trip you up whether it's sex, drugs, rock & roll, whatever it is, gambling, food, you know, you can overdo it in any of those, so it does come down to being a responsible adult.

And if you think that people in our community aren't responsible enough to handle it, you know, that's really what you're doing. I don't know that you can say that, well, people in our community aren't responsible enough to put their edibles away.

Well, that's like saying it's not responsible enough to lock up your liquor cabinet. It's a legitimate point, but I don't think you can regulate every household and say, well, you can't sell it here because you're not responsible enough. That's my pin on the edibles.

I mean, I do see that there is a risk hazard, but if you're going to be responsible enough to buy it, you should be responsible enough to put it away just like your prescription drugs, just like your alcohol.

One of the criterias I was thinking that we can put on there was -- this is what I don't like about -- you know, you go to Eugene and you see all these flashy signs with the balloon blowup guy and the guy spinning the sign like a pizza, you know. You don't get to do that for alcohol. OLCC doesn't allow that for the liquor store to do that, and I don't think that should be allowed on the

```
freeway if there was any kind of flashy neon signs.
 1
 2
    That would be a criteria that we would -- that I
 3
    would like to see put on it if it did pass or it
    does pass.
 4
 5
                   As far as the zoning of where it's at,
    I think the City Council -- or, I mean, the planning
 6
 7
    commission did a -- we did extensive work to put it
    where it is. We thought that was the best location
 8
 9
    in the whole town for that. And so to say, well,
    that's not a good location, that's the best location
10
11
    we all came up with for a place to put it.
                   So to say it's not the right place,
12
    well, we didn't do our job, then, if you're saying
13
    it's not the right place to have it. (Inaudible)
14
    commercial, not on a highway, out of downtown,
15
     (inaudible) criteria are met long ago.
16
17
                   So I don't know if you can do a
    conditional use for a year and -- trial year -- and
18
    see how it goes and see if there are any complaints.
19
20
    But I guess if I was going to vote -- which I don't
    get -- but if I was going to vote, I would vote in
21
22
    favor of allowing the application to proceed.
23
                   COMMISSIONER: Thank you.
                                               Thanks,
    Rob. And would you like to speak against or for the
24
25
    applicant? Or just listening?
```

44

```
UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER:
                                                  If I was
 1
 2
     speaking, I would be speaking against, and so I
 3
    suppose just to give you some balance --
                   COMMISSIONER: You submitted the
 4
 5
    letter.
             Right?
                   UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER:
 6
                                                  Yes.
 7
    And you have that before you. I assume everyone has
 8
    a copy. I have nothing to add other than that.
 9
                   COMMISSIONER: Okay. Before we close
    the public portion, are there any specific questions
10
11
    anybody would like to ask the Simpsons?
                   (Inaudible.)
12
13
                   UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER:
    believe Rob brought up a point -- his final point
14
15
    was -- if I remember right, I don't know if we can
    do a conditional use permit for one year.
16
17
     (Inaudible).
18
                   SCOTT:
                           I can. So going back to the
    dog situation that you had. You know, the planning
19
20
    commission, as part of the report that staff brought
    to you, has that in there that, you know, you can
21
    put a condition on it to see what those, if any,
22
23
    adverse impacts are over the course of that year,
    and it can be re-evaluated.
24
25
                   UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER:
                                                  Okay.
```

```
45
```

SCOTT: So that is something -- I also 1 2 want to -- I also want to say something because 3 Mr. Simpson made a very valid point, too, that I want to address. 4 5 So, you know, bottom line is the State of Oregon says, absolutely, yes, this is all legal, 6 right. So the bottom line is locally, of course, we 7 8 have due process. So as I think Mr. Rob Wendgren 9 made the point, you know, if -- regardless of how it turns out, if it turns out not in favor of the 10 11 applicant, due process does happen. So they will -- they will be required 12 to go to the Council for that. If the Council would 13 uphold the denial, then it will go to the Land Use 14 Board of Appeals -- what is it? 15 COMMISSIONER: 16 LUBA. 17 SCOTT: LUBA, yeah, Land Use Board of 18 appeals. That didn't sound right to me for some reason in my mind. 19 20 Anyway, the attorney said on that front -- I'm just telling you what the attorney 21 said -- is -- the bottom line is the Land Use Board 22 of Appeals is going to stamp that "granted" and he's 23 going to send it back down to me as city 24 25 administrator and send it to the Mayor's attention

```
1
     and say, hey, you guys, you know, do your work.
 2
     This is -- this is required.
                   That does not mean that you have to
 3
     vote a certain way. It means that you look at the
 4
 5
     criteria. Again, it gets into that scale situation
 6
     that I talked about earlier. So I'm just giving you
 7
     a broadbrush stroke of what the whole process would
 8
     look like.
 9
                   COMMISSIONER: So now would be the
10
     time to put conditions on it that we would want
11
    before it goes to Council?
12
                   SCOTT:
                           Yes. Well, either you do
13
    tonight or it goes to Council and they do it.
14
                   COMMISSIONER: It won't go to Council
15
    if we approve it.
16
                   SCOTT:
                           Truth. That is truth.
17
                   COMMISSIONER:
                                  It won't go to Council.
18
                   SCOTT:
                           Right.
                   COMMISSIONER: And I do take
19
20
    exception, Rob, that -- yeah, I think the planning
21
    commission -- I think this is an appropriate
22
    conditional -- it's an appropriate thing for us to
23
    review.
24
                   And your comment about it really
25
    should end up in the Council anyway, I'm just saying
```

```
47
```

```
-- just saying.
 1
 2
                   COMMISSIONER:
                                  Go ahead.
 3
                   COMMISSIONER:
                                  Personal opinion.
                   COMMISSIONER: I mean, is it a moot
 4
 5
    point that it's legal to have it here and like what
    are we doing? Are we just here to put some
 6
 7
    conditional use on it? Or are we just here to voice
 8
    our opinion for the Council?
 9
                   I mean, if what they say is true and
    what you say is true, they can legally have a store,
10
11
    what are we doing?
                   SCOTT: As long as they meet the
12
    conditional use.
13
                   COMMISSIONER: Why do we even have to
14
    vote?
15
                   COMMISSIONER:
                                  I've been listening to
16
17
    all of this very carefully because -- from a
    personal standpoint, I tried marijuana twice, and I
18
    hated it both times. I was in my twenties, and I
19
20
    hated it. I don't know why anybody would want to
21
    smoke it, and I don't like people to smoke it and I
    don't like when they use it, but, frankly, that's
22
23
    none of my business so long as they -- I don't like
    people to get drunk either.
24
25
                   But I don't see in here anywhere where
```

```
it says we're supposed to vote based upon how we
 1
 2
    feel about it. And if we use our personal opinion
 3
    as to the use of marijuana, we're going outside of
    all this criteria. We're not -- we're not passing a
 4
 5
    moral vote here as to whether it's right or wrong.
    We're just passing a vote on whether or not they
 6
 7
    have done what all of this paperwork says they are
 8
     supposed to do, whether we agree with it or not.
 9
                   COMMISSIONER: And I don't think
     (inaudible).
10
11
                   COMMISSIONER:
                                  Okay.
                   COMMISSIONER: It's like -- take it
12
    back to the coffee is -- some people felt that -- I
13
    said that I would love the smell of coffee.
14
15
    people said they wouldn't like the smell of coffee.
    Some people think that dogs barking are annoying.
16
17
    Other people say that's part of living in the
18
    country.
                   So -- but still, we approached it as
19
20
    kind of scientifically as we could, weighing those
21
    potential adverse effects against the surrounding
22
    uses.
23
                   COMMISSIONER:
                                  Correct.
                   COMMISSIONER: So when I look at this
24
25
    -- and I don't have anything against marijuana
```

```
1
    because I was strongly in favor of the medical
 2
    marijuana and I told the Simpsons that -- I'm sorry,
 3
     I keep calling you the Simpsons -- but Ashford and
     Simpsons -- however, I do -- came across is what I
 4
     feel is some empirical evidence that tells me that
 5
 6
    now this part of the, criteria there is an adverse
 7
     impact that I feel there is some scientific evidence
 8
     for.
                   I'm okay with medical marijuana and
 9
10
    the use or even people using it whenever they want
         But now I'm being asked does recreational
11
    potentially have an adverse effect? So -- but it's
12
    hard not to separate -- it's a fine line between
13
14
    personal feelings and when you're determining
    adverse.
15
16
                   COMMISSIONER:
                                  Well, I agree, and I'm
17
    not necessarily making (inaudible) my remarks.
                   COMMISSIONER: Yeah, I know.
18
                   COMMISSIONER: But to me, we should
19
20
    not be voting on whether we are for or against --
21
                   COMMISSIONER:
                                  I agree.
22
                   COMMISSIONER:
                                  -- the use of
23
    marijuana.
24
                   COMMISSIONER:
                                  I agree.
25
                   COMMISSIONER:
                                  Our personal opinion
```

1	should stay out of this whole thing together.
2	COMMISSIONER: Right.
3	COMMISSIONER: Yeah.
4	COMMISSIONER: And just based upon
5	some of the discussions I've heard among this group
6	of people, I've cringed, because I've sensed that
7	they are projecting their personal feelings into
8	this rather than what it says on the paper.
9	And I would urge for us not to do
10	that. This is not a place for us to vote our
11	personal opinions on morality or whatever you would
12	call it.
13	COMMISSIONER: Well, the truth be
14	known on my part, if you're thinking about me, I
15	could care less if everybody smoked pot. I could
16	absolutely care less. But I do not believe that
17	facility fits in this area. I just don't.
18	COMMISSIONER: Why?
19	COMMISSIONER: Just doesn't.
20	COMMISSIONER: Why?
21	COMMISSIONER: It doesn't I
22	believe okay, so if we went down to B on this, it
23	doesn't fit there.
24	COMMISSIONER: On where?
25	COMMISSIONER: In my opinion. Weren't

Case 6:19-cv-01540-IM Document 1-2 Filed 09/24/19 Page 62 of 66

City of Brownsville Planning Commission Meeting Transcribed from CD Simpson July 31, 2017

```
we discussing B, adverse?
 1
 2
                    COMMISSIONER:
                                   Page 6.
                   COMMISSIONER:
                                   Page 6B.
 3
                   COMMISSIONER:
                                   Right.
 4
 5
                   COMMISSIONER:
                                   1B?
 6
                   COMMISSIONER:
                                   Right.
 7
                   COMMISSIONER:
                                   Adverse impact.
 8
                   COMMISSIONER:
                                   Right (inaudible).
 9
                   COMMISSIONER:
                                   Okay.
10
                   COMMISSIONER: And adversely that, as
     we call it the pocket park, that's going to
11
     adversely affect that. That's my opinion.
12
13
                   COMMISSIONER:
                                  Okay. Well, that's
14
     fine. Yeah, yeah.
15
                   COMMISSIONER:
                                  Okay. I probably need
     to officially close the public portion of the
16
     meeting again, so that is closed.
17
18
                   Any members have any further topics
19
     for further discussion?
20
                   COMMISSIONER: Are you ready for a
     motion?
21
22
                   COMMISSIONER: We've got to take a
    vote first, don't we?
23
24
                   SCOTT: You need a motion.
25
                   COMMISSIONER: I mean you can --
```

Notice of Removal Defs' Ex. 2 (62 of 66)

51

```
Yeah.
 1
                   COMMISSIONER:
                                          So --
                   COMMISSIONER: Put it out there for
 2
 3
     the vote.
                I'm going to take a motion.
                   COMMISSIONER:
                                   It sounds like we can
 4
 5
     do that.
 6
                   COMMISSIONER: I would move that
 7
     (inaudible) -- well written out. I just have to
     find it.
 8
 9
                   I would move that we approve the
     application for the sale of recreational marijuana
10
     and include with that the conditions of approval
11
12
     that staff was recommending on page 10 of their
13
     report.
14
                   COMMISSIONER:
                                   Okay. Thank you, Don.
     Is there a second for that motion?
15
16
                   COMMISSIONER:
                                   I second it.
                   COMMISSIONER: Mike seconds the
17
    motion. Let's take a vote. Brian, what say you?
18
19
    For or against?
20
                           Against.
                   BRIAN:
21
                   COMMISSIONER:
                                   Okay.
                                         (Inaudible).
22
                   COMMISSIONER:
                                   Against.
                   COMMISSIONER:
                                   Okay. (Inaudible).
23
24
                   COMMISSIONER:
                                   For.
25
                   COMMISSIONER:
                                   For.
```

Case 6:19-cv-01540-IM Document 1-2 Filed 09/24/19 Page 64 of 66

City of Brownsville Planning Commission Meeting Transcribed from CD Simpson July 31, 2017

```
1
                    COMMISSIONER:
                                   Against.
 2
                    COMMISSIONER:
                                   Against.
 3
                                   So it's four to two
                   COMMISSIONER:
 4
     against.
 5
                   COMMISSIONER: So what do we do from
     here?
 6
 7
                   SCOTT:
                           Okay.
                                   So what happens from
     here, the vote was called, the vote is four-two
 8
 9
     against the use. What will happen now is within
10
     five days, Mrs. Coleman will draft the notice of
                Mr. and Ms. Ashford and Simpson will be
11
     decision.
12
     able to appeal that decision within 15 days of that
13
     notice to the City Council, and they will hear all
14
     of the testimony and everything at the City Council
     meeting in September.
15
16
                   COMMISSIONER: Okay. So we just close
     out the meeting?
17
18
                   SCOTT: Well, we've got -- there's
19
     another agenda item. But, yes, that portion of the
20
     meeting.
21
                   COMMISSIONER: Go ahead and close out
22
     the request for conditional use.
23
                   SCOTT:
                           There was a roll call vote
24
     taken.
             Did you record the roll call?
25
                   UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER:
                                                  I did.
```

53

Case 6:19-cv-01540-IM Document 1-2 Filed 09/24/19 Page 65 of 66

City of Brownsville Planning Commission Meeting Transcribed from CD Simpson July 31, 2017

```
54
     Just to be clear, Commissioner Wyant was a no.
 1
 2
     MacDaniel was a no. Thompson was a yes. Andrews
 3
     was a yes. Compton was a no. And Kometz was a no.
 4
                    COMMISSIONER: And Rob abstains.
 5
                    UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER:
 6
     (Inaudible) right. Okay. Thank you.
 7
                             --000--
 8
 9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
                                                     Notice of Removal
```

Defs' Ex. 2 (65 of 66)

Case 6:19-cv-01540-IM Document 1-2 Filed 09/24/19 Page 66 of 66

```
55
     STATE OF OREGON
 1
 2
                       )
                          SS.
     County of Lane
 3
 4
 5
 6
            I, Sara Fahey Wilson, CSR, a Certified
 7
     Shorthand Reporter for the State of Oregon, certify
 8
     that the transcript is a true record of the
     transcription of the audio recording; that the
 9
     foregoing transcript consisting of 54 pages contains
10
    a full, true, and correct transcript of said audio
11
    recording so reported by me to the best of my
12
    ability on said date.
13
            IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have set my hand
14
    this 11th day of September 2017, in the City of
15
    Eugene, County of Lane, State of Oregon.
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
    Sara Fahey Wilson, CSR
23
    CSR No. 06-0400
24
25
    Expires: March 31, 2020
```